Remarks

Reconsideration of the above-captioned application is respectfully requested. All pending claims (1-22) have been rejected as being anticipated by Landsman et al. To overcome the rejections, independent Claims 1, 7, and 14 have been amended to recite displaying the ads in an advertisement history window (a window displaying Internet content composed only of advertisements) as shown in Figure 1 and disclosed on, e.g., page 7.

Claims 1-22 remain pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Landsman et al., which teaches downloading ads to a user computer using an applet and then automatically playing multimedia content associated with the ads on the user computer during "interstitial" intervals (intervals between web page transitions), to free the user from any action whatsoever in displaying the ads, col. 10, lines 55-60; col. 11, lines 3-15; col. 39, lines 59-67. In other words, Landsman et al. automatically displays ads in the periods when the user clicks from one Web page to another.

In contrast, Claim 1 is directed to an entirely different solution, namely, saving ads, displaying them in an ad history window, and then allowing the user to access the ads using the ad history window. Note that this solution is precisely what Landsman et al. teaches away from at col. 10, lines 55-60. In Claim 1, the user must affirmatively navigate through the ad history window to select an ad. No such window is taught or suggested in Landsman et al. because there is no need for one - the agent of Landsman et al. takes care of ad selection and playing.

Claim 7 as now amended recites that the program displays saved advertisements in an advertisement window such that a user may select a saved advertisement from the window for display on the user computer. For the reasons set forth above, it believed that Claim 7 and its dependent claims are patentable.

Also, as now amended Claim 14 recites allowing a user to access saved advertisements in an advertisement history window displaying only advertisements, and for the reasons above it is believed that Claim 14 and its dependent claims are patentable.

It has been alleged that Landsman et al. "inherently" encompasses "the method of viewing" of Claims 20-22 in that this is "inherent" in Landsman et al.'s browser.

To be "inherent", a prior art reference must ***necessarily*** include the allegedly inherent characteristic, MPEP §2112.

Claims 20-22 do not merely claim "viewing" Internet content, but rather something more specific that not only is not necessary in browsers, it is not present in any current browsers to the best of Applicant's knowledge. More particularly, Claim 20 requires, among other things, initiating a request to view an advertisement history, and then viewing first and second banner advertisements within the advertisement history. No current browser has an "advertisement history" as that term is used in the present application even broadly construed; rather, the only "history" files in current browsers are those that contain all downloaded content, not just ads. Accordingly, it is improper to reject the present novel invention as being "inherent" in prior art which not only fails to require it as is otherwise necessary under the MPEP to support an inherency rejection, but n fact which has no need or motivation for it at all.

The Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (619) 338-8075 for any reason which would advance the instant application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1176-3.AMD